

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated July 24, 2006, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered.

Claims 1-158 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 are in independent form. All independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 of the present application have been amended, each in accordance with the originally-filed specification, to more clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art. Six new claims have been added (159-164) and are dependent upon the six amended independent claims respectively.

Initially, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-158 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting in view of claims 1-42 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/869,513 to Applicant. Applicant notes that this rejection is provisional and therefore will address this matter when the conflicting claims in the co-pending application have been patented.

Control Rules Differentiate the Attendee's Participation in Convention Activity

The present invention provides a specialist website service technology, where the meeting planner client (or administrator) and the exhibitor client can themselves separately self-develop, pre-load and fully maintain, through central website database-server program instruction control, single, multiple-show, or virtual convention website processes. Applicant's published application US 2001/0014865, clearly establishes the differences between the present invention and the cited prior art, e.g., control rules differentiate the participation in a wide array of convention activity for the attendee client within this specialist website service.

At least a portion of the fundamental and patentable novelty of the website service system of the present invention in terms of the control parameter rules differentiating participation in convention activity as set forth in the Brief Summary of the Invention (*see*

col. 2, paragraph [0016] of the published application US 2001/0014865) with: “The system receives and stores initial convention data, and control parameter rules from meeting planner clients”; and “Based on search criteria provided by the participating attendee client, the central website server releases stored database convention information and provides a wide array of convention activity simulated with the program instructions and the databases.”

The present application defines the details of the website programs receiving the control parameter rules and processing to differentiate participation in convention activity – a central part of furnishing this specialist website service. Applicant draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 5, paragraph [0092], the paragraph wherein the FIG. 4 block diagram is introduced (which illustrates the hierarchy/relationship system of individual sub-process programs 500, 600, 700, 800 and 900) and the processing relationship of the program instructions 400 as a whole to uphold and maintain the particular attendee program instructions 500. In the middle of this cited paragraph we see this widespread processing foundation of the program instructions 400 and their consequential objective of differentiating the participation within this specialist website process by the attendee client. Please read: “These program instructions 400 comprise the information input, processing and output procedures including but not limited to receiving queries, control parameters and content information from any of the three client types, processing in terms of differentiating and storing the information, and releasing appropriate and formatted information. Described in simplest terms, the attendee client global searches and control program instructions 500 on the central website server 200 assists the attendee client 101 in determining what conventions are appropriate for their participation”.

However, as discussed in the Brief Summary (*see* col. 2, paragraph [0016], *ibid*), the meeting planner must first load the control parameter rules before “participation” of the attendee client. It is the meeting planner’s initial loading of the control parameter rules and convention content information, within the program instructions 400, that eventually

guides attendee client's "participation", and is further specified within a discussion of FIG. 8 at col. 13, paragraph [0181] with: "The system then provides the meeting planner client 102 the dive-down program flow control to initially load and later change the control parameter rules and content information into the virtual convention venue databases 300 for each specific convention. The parameter rules and content information supports the "100% cyber-based convention 600", the "venue-with-cyber convention 700", and the fees and policies used in the exhibitor/sponsor client support--program instructions 900." As cited above, individual programs 600, 700 and 900 are part of the program instructions 400 as a whole.

Individual control parameter rules differentiate participation within at least one specific convention. At col. 13, paragraph [0184], the specification reiterates the meeting planner client (or administrator) sub-process contained by program instructions 800 with the associated control parameter rules and content information with: "The meeting planner services 810 program instructions provides the meeting planner client 102 the dive-down program flow control to initially load and later change the control parameter rules and content information into the virtual convention venue databases 300 for each specific convention." And at col. 13, paragraphs [0185-0197] these purposeful "control parameter rules" were made known in terms of the "processing flow" within specific convention activities. For example, these include: convention processing flow control parameters, exhibitor client booth criteria and control parameters; sessions and forums processing flow control parameters; call for papers processing flow control parameters; and, cyber broadcast processing flow control parameters.

The control parameter rules differentiate at a higher programming processing level of this specialist website service with the attendee client's processing "direction" flow to the convention activity in either the cyber-based conventions 600 or the venue-based with cyber conventions 700. "The convention selection 505 program instructions process provides query search options of the virtual convention venue databases 300 and resultant pathway(s)

to the appropriate convention welcome page display. These program instructions are directed to either or both of cyber conventions 600 and venue based and cyber conventions 700.” Col. 6, paragraph [0101]. The identifiable loading of the control parameter rules to direct this higher level flow between the 600 and 700 program instructions can be found at (*see* col. 13, paragraph [0186] *ibid*) with “convention processing flow control parameters”.

The meeting planner client’s (or administrator’s) command of this specialist website service system through the control parameter rules is emphasized as “significant” over “attending” and “participation” by the attendee client for the “wide array of convention activity”. “Similar to the meetings for professional work with physical convention centers (e.g., venue-based centers) in the convention industry, the meeting planner client 102 has significant control of specific “conventions” (e.g., standard conventions, events, conferences, trade shows and meetings) in the virtual convention venue invention.” Col. 13, paragraph [0182]. Within this same cited paragraph, we can also read the processing function of the individual program 800 and the direct reference to the extensive convention activity program instructions depicted at FIG. 6 with: “The meeting planner client support - program instructions 800 in terms of the meeting planner client 102 was described in the FIG. 6”. And FIG. 6 was defined as “a sitemap flow diagram of cyber conventions with cyber exhibit booth display, and cyber sessions and forums – program instructions”; and, within the specification describing these same “program instructions” (i.e., FIG. 6 – Block 600), we again find this “wide array of convention activity” with: “The attendee client 101 now has a wide array of convention activity simulated with the program instructions and the databases.”

At col. 9, paragraph [0146], it is further explained that the wide array of convention activity of the “cyber-based convention 600 program instructions” controlled pathways with: “The attendee client 101 has several major selection choices with follow-up database query and page display processing including a convention welcome message 605, registration desk 610, cyber/exhibit booths 615 with display, cyber sessions 620, cyber

forums 625, sponsors list 630, call for papers 635, papers and proceedings presentations 640, cyber broadcast schedule and events 645, and sponsor opportunities 650. Each of these programmed selection choices has special search and database list, dive-down program flow control, web page display or follow-on processing capabilities”.

And then at col. 11, paragraph [0165], it is recognized that the alike wide array of convention activity includes: “the venue-with-cyber convention 700 program instructions provide a wide array of processing using the virtual convention venue databases 300. The convention in this programming control section is again specific and defined. “Dive down” or sub-processing within this section is limited to the specific convention.” And further in the same citation, “the attendee client 101 has several major selection choices with follow-up database query and page display processing including a convention welcome message 705, registration desk 710, exhibits 715 with display, sessions 720, forums list 725, sponsors list 730, membership 735, call for papers 740, papers and proceedings presentations 745, cyber broadcast schedule and events 750, and sponsor opportunities 755. Each of these programmed selection choices has special search and database lists, dive-down program flow control, web page display or follow-on processing capabilities”.

Taken as a whole, these above specifications and references clearly demonstrate that after a selection for convention content information is received at the website server from the attendee client, that selection is then processed by the program instructions 400 applying the individual pre-loaded control parameter rules to differentiate participation in a wide array of convention activity. Hence, these above references and limitations from the specification show important features of the Applicant’s invention that can be utilized in the amended claims.

Amended Claims Discussion

The preamble in independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 were amended and returned to the original standing to assist in assuring that the process steps or structural

limitations are able to stand alone. Paragraph 52 of the current 7/24/2006 Office Action was taken into consideration; therefore, the words “wherein this exchange is accomplished with web browser computers at said clients, with program instructions on a central website server” were deleted. Also, the Applicant has moved the appropriate limitations placed in the preamble and put them in the body of the claim in order to attend to the Examiner’s comments in this regard.

Subsequent to the preamble amendment, the Applicant has also carefully re-evaluated the Examiner’s previous Response (*see* Office Action dated 12/12/2005, page 14): “In response to applicant’s argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.” The remaining amendments strengthen the proposed claims by means of such unique features.

To assist in better referencing the distinctive and significant specification “control parameter rules” as found in the invention (including the citations as noted above), and to particularly utilize the exactness and clarity of the word “rule” which assists to lay emphasis on the patentable novelty of the claims, “program instruction control parameters” has been amended to “at least one control parameter rule” within the process steps a. and c. of independent claims 1, 40, 43, 82 and 120; and, similar steps a. and d. of independent claim 39.

After that, process step c. of independent claims 1, 40, 43, 82 and 120, and the similar process step d. of independent claim 39, have been amended to read: “processing the selection at the central website server by program instructions applying the at least one control parameter rule to differentiate participation in convention activity”.

This process step clearly and precisely references the comprehensive specification of the present invention as discussed at length above: “processing the selection at the central website server” references the central website server 200; “by programming instructions” references the program instructions 400. The “applying the at least one control parameter rule” references the abovementioned “control parameter rules” and the specific “control parameters” “for each specific convention” as noted at col. 13, paragraphs [0184-0197], of the specification, by means of the applying of such a “rule” by the “program instructions”; “applying” being accurately employed in terms of the root verb “to apply” as defined in Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary (direct quote follows): “to have relevance or a valid connection <this rule applies to freshmen only>”. Hence, there is such a relevance or valid connection “by the program instructions applying the at least one control parameter rule”; hence, the rules are clearly being applied within the program instructions. And further, defining the “applying the at least one control parameter rule” to “differentiate participation in convention activity”. The reader was shown the same term “differentiating” within the above cited specification (*see* col. 5, paragraph [0092]). And finally in this process step, the “participation in convention activity.” was also fully cited within the significant specification as shown above in terms of either: 1) the higher level of convention activity in the cyber-based conventions 600 (*see* col. 9, paragraph [0146]) or the venue-based with cyber conventions 700 (*see* col. 11, paragraph [0165]); or, 2) within specific convention activity (*see* col. 13, paragraphs [0185-0197]).

Finally, six new dependent claims have been added (Claims 159-164) to address the rationale for a “plurality of control parameter rules” of the six amended independent claims respectively (claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120). Therefore, the features upon which the Applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model) are now clearly recited in the amended claims and further clarified in the new dependent claims. Any such limitations from the specification are accurately placed into the amended claims.

Summary - The Fundamental Differences

Respectfully, the Applicant has with each office action very carefully considered all particular columns and line numbers in the Salesky patent in their entirety, as well as the context of such passages as disclosed by the Examiner. With respect to paragraph 52 of the current Office Action, the Applicant respectfully reassures the Examiner that he has certainly fully reviewed the entire Salesky reference and not simply focused on certain citations or limited portions thereof. While we may cite specific places in the application in our arguments, that does not mean we have neglected the remaining portions.

In previously-filed Responses and Amendments, the Applicant has distinguished primary, valid and important differences between the present invention and the Salesky patent. By and large, these differences comprise:

- the dissimilar system topologies (i.e., “the ‘communications server’ connecting the ‘source’ and ‘sink’ client machines of the ‘communicants’ during a communication session” (col. 3, lines 56-58 of the Salesky patent) against specialist website service program instructions on a central website server of the present invention);
- the dissimilar primary applications (i.e., the “tightly bound” (col. 7, line 22) webcast communications sessions of the Salesky patent against the conducting of convention activity of the present invention); and,
- the dissimilar intended use of convention content information (i.e., the “stored meeting contents” (col. 24, lines 66-67) - mere naming or description of the stored recordings of the communications session data streams - of the Salesky patent against the convention content information, together with the intended use of program instruction control parameter rules, in a system of ASP-type processing at the central website server of the present invention). And, that the databases and website program instructions of the Application, on a central website server, are

important structural differences between the claimed invention and the Salesky patent.

In Paragraphs 54, 55 and 56 of the current Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the system of the Salesky patent has “program instructions on a central website server” referencing column 7, lines 1-4 and Fig. 1 (references 18 a-c, and 12) of the Salesky patent. The Applicant does not concur with the Examiner. These portions of the Salesky patent specification merely indicate that the system of the Salesky patent includes a conference server 14 and a data network 16 for communication purposes.

Reading Claims 1 and 2 of the Salesky patent, we found that the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a screen display, or shared portion of a data set, which the conference server transmits those said portions with two or more clients in parallel – while the server performs communications-related data stream controls such as network speed and loads changes, compression, decompression, and output data type manipulations. In today’s Internet language, we would call the Salesky patent a real-time webcast system; we find noteworthy similar use to today’s term webcast with “broadcast” in the Salesky patent at (col 7, line 17), (col 14, line 55), (col 23, line 24), and (col 25, line 17). And “transmitting” is also used in both Claim 1 and Claim 2 of the Salesky patent. Thus, the Salesky patent is a shared-display and shared-data set communications system between PCs in parallel – a real-time webcast system.

The Salesky patent is not related to the invention of the present amended application, which describes a specialized website service or “ASP” model where the program instructions apply at least one control parameter rule in differentiating participation in convention. The Salesky patent does not discuss such a model of the present invention. The clients-in-parallel shared-display communications webcast system as described in the Salesky patent is not comparable to the Applicant’s unaccompanied-clients-not-in-parallel website/ASP-based convention system. The system and method claimed by the Salesky

patent, performed in its normal and usual operation, does not perform the system and method claimed by Applicant. Still further, there is nothing inherent about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information, including functional descriptive material, is loaded by a meeting planner client with the intended use of providing the website/ASP-based system. The model for online conventions of the Applicant is not the model by the system of the Salesky patent.

To assist in further distinguishing the differences between the present invention and the Salesky patent, all independent claims of the present application have been amended as fully discussed above to more clearly demonstrate Applicant's specialized website service or "ASP" model. This was accomplished by placing the limitation "processing the selection at the central website server by program instructions" in the body of all independent claims. This new language clearly distinguishes the difference between the Applicant's model and the system of the Salesky patent. It should be noted that the word or terms "website", "website program", "website program instructions", or "central website" do not appear in the Salesky patent.

However, to further augment the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model), all independent claims have also been amended with respect to the method of conducting at least one convention after pre-loading at least one control parameter rule, and applying the rule to differentiate participation in convention activity. This amendment clearly delineates this specialist website service technology from the Salesky patent. The Salesky patent is a shared-display communications webcast system with conferencing software loaded on the presenter client computer and the attendee client computer – not a specialized website service with software on the central website server differentiating participation in convention activity as now claimed in the Applicant's invention. These amendments are also detailed above.

With respect to paragraph 57 of the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully took this response into consideration when amending “program instruction control parameter” to the now clearly specified “the least one control parameter rule” that is utilized in the processing at the central website server “to differentiate participation in convention activity”.

Reconsideration Respectfully Requested

The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art. For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Claims 44-81 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 43, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 43. Claims 83-119 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 82, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 82. Claims 121-158 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to


independent claim 120, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 120. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42, 44-81, 83-119 and 121-158 is respectfully requested.

Finally, the six new claims 159-164 depend either directly or indirectly from or add further limitations to the six amended independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 respectively.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-164 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 
Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com